

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 PROJECT SENTINEL; DOREEN
12 CORDERO; and JILL HICKEY,
13 individually and on behalf of the
14 GENERAL PUBLIC,

Plaintiffs,

v.

15 KAMAL LAL and USHA LAL,
16 individually; KAMAL LAL, in his capacity
17 as Trustee of the LAL FAMILY TRUST
18 OF 1998; and BABU PRASAD, in his
capacity as Trustee of the LAL FAMILY
TRUST OF 1998,

Defendants.

No. 1:98-cv-05688-LJO

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY
COMPLIANCE STATEMENT
REQUIREMENT SHOULD NOT BE
DISCONTINUED

(Doc. No. 195)

21 This is a housing discrimination case filed on June 22, 1998, in which the parties entered
22 into a consent decree on May 22, 2000. (*See* Doc. No. 195.) The decree requires that “[e]ach
23 year on the anniversary date of the entry of this consent decree, defendants and their Authorized
24 Rental Agent(s) shall file with this Court and serve [plaintiff] Project Sentinel with a statement
25 signed under penalty of perjury verifying” certain information specified in the agreement, “over
26 the last year.” (*Id.* at § II(13).) The Court retained jurisdiction for purposes of enforcement, (*id.*
27 at § II(14)), and the docket demonstrates annual compliance reports filed by defendant Kamal Lal
28 from 2005 through 2020, (Doc. Nos. 223-238). During the certification period referenced, no

1 enforcement action has been initiated or requested.

2 In light the history related above, the Court **ORDERS** plaintiffs to **SHOW CAUSE** in
3 writing whether continued annual certification remains necessary in this matter. Plaintiffs shall
4 file a response to this order no later than **July 14, 2020**.

5
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: May 18, 2020

Dale A. Drayd
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE